APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,289	06/10/2005	Michiaki Tatsubori	JP920020206US1	9237

47069   7590   04/15/2010
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 December 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>31-34 and 40-64</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>31-34 and 40-64</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 31-34, 40-64 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 12/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not
persuasive.

3.   As per remarks, Applicants argued that (1) Sheinis fails to teach or disclose the claimed
limitation of "acquiring an object access authority set for the object indicating access authorities
for methods called by the object".

4.   As to point (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims are to be given their broadest
reasonable interpretation during prosecution, and the scope of a claim cannot be narrowed by
reading disclosed limitations into the claim. See In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2D
1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2D 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir.
1989); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541,550 (CCPA 1969). In this case, Sheinis
clearly discloses the above claimed limitation as mentioned in paragraph 0007, entity-based
security can be desirable to control access to an entity bean that is the target of a method call, in
paragraph 0017, the request is for a method associated with the server object, in paragraph 0110,
the entity security check for a call for a method of a component interface of an entity bean is

typcially performed before the EJB method call, and in paragraph 0130, and in addition, Sheinis

provides an example that clearly discloses the above claimed limitation, i.e. a "viewer" is

permitted to call a method named viewSalary() that allows him to view a salary contained in an

EmployeeRecord entity bean and an "administrator" is permitted to call methods called

createSalary(), viewSalary(), updateSalary() and removeSalary(). As such, the claim remains

rejected over Sheinis reference.

5.   As per remarks, Applicants argued that (2) nowhere in Srivastava teaches or mentions

searching for results for a previous execution of an object in response to determining that the

user access authority permits access to the method called by the object.

6.   As to point (2), Srivastava discloses caching information that instructs the services engine

to use cache memory for particular operation, and inform the engine how long the cached data

should be retained and when it should be considered to be expired [paragraphs 0070 and 0089],

and ExecutionManager is the coordination of service response caching through the cache

manager, that implies that the ExecutionManager is responsible check for the availability of

cached service responses before executing a service, if such response is available, no service will

be executed and the cached response will be returned to the client [i.e. broadly interpreted as

searching for results for a previous execution of an object as claimed] [paragraph 0220].

Therefore, Srivastava teaches the claimed limitation as written.

7.   As per remarks concerning claims 40, 50 and 59, Applicants provided the same
arguments as in claim 31, and as such, the response is indicated in point (1) above.

8.   As per remarks concerning claims 41, 51 and 60, the response is provided in point (1)
above. In response to the argument concerning the additional methods called by the methods of
the object, Sheinis teaches this limitation as well, i.e. one or more methods providing the logic
and functionality that are employed to determine the access rights of an access request [
paragraph 0083].

9.   As per remarks, Applicants argued that (3) Sheinis does not teach or suggest denying
access to the execution results if the access authority of one method called by the requested
object is unknown.

10.   As to point (3), Sheinis discloses the access control manager examines the access control
rules and makes an initial determination as to whether to approve or reject the call, and there is
an access control rule that states "allow call of type "B" for only certain people", and the type of
call that was received was a call of type "B", then an initial determination will be made that "No"
the call is not approved, and the method will advance to step 234 so that a further determination
as to whether to approve or reject the call can be made [i.e. broadly interpreted as denying
access to the execution results if the access authority of one method called by the requested
object is unknown as claimed] [paragraphs 0092-0098].

11.   As per remarks, Applicants argued that (4) Sheinis does not teach or suggest the claims of

executing an object even if access to execution results are not granted.

12.   As to point (4), it is rejected as mentioned in the previous Office Action. Furthermore,

Sheinis discloses the system to control access at least partially based on user's entity to the result

of any method on the home or component interface of an entity or session bean [paragraphs

0113, 0157 and 0158].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 31-34, 40-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sheinis et al. [US Patent Application No 2004/0019809], in view of Srivastava et al. [US

Patent Application No 2002/0120685].

15.   As per claim 31, Sheinis discloses the invention as claimed including a method,

comprising:

receiving a call request from a user to execute an object [i.e. receiving a request to access at least one of a plurality of server objects on a server [210, Figure 3; and paragraphs 0010 and 0087];

determining an access authority for the user; acquiring an object access authority set for the object indicating access authorities for methods called by the object; comparing the user access authority and the object access authority set to determine whether the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object [i.e. determining whether the call is authorized] [230, Figure 3; Figure 4; and paragraphs 0090-0098, and 0109-0113].

Sheinis does not specifically disclose

searching a storage section storing execution results for a previous execution of the object prior to executing the call request and in response to determining that the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object.

Srivastava discloses

searching a storage section storing execution results for a previous execution of the object prior to executing the call request and in response to determining that the user access authority permits access to the methods called by the object [i.e. ExecutionManager is responsible check for the availability of cached service responses before executing a service] [paragraphs 0070, 0089, 0220, and 0345-0347].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sheinis and Srivastava because the teaching of Srivastava on caching would enable to improve system performance and reduce communication overhead.

16.   As per claim 32, Sheinis discloses wherein the call request is received over a network,

and wherein the execution results are transmitted over the network [Figures 1 and 2; and

paragraphs 0065-0068] and wherein the call request with respect to the object comprises a

request for Web services [paragraph 0083].

17.   As per claim 33, Srivastava discloses transmitting the execution results for the previous

execution of the object prior to executing the call request with respect to the object in response to

determining that the storage section stores the execution results for the previous execution of the

object subject to the call request [i.e. return the cache response to the client] [paragraph 0220].

18.   As per claim 34, Srivastava discloses passing the call request to an object executor in

response to determining that the storage section does not store execution results for the previous

execution of the object subject to the call request [i.e. check for available in cache] [paragraph

0220].

19.   As per claim 40, Sheinis discloses determining methods called by the object; determining

an access authority for each determined method; generating the object access authority set to

comprise the determined access authorities of the determined methods, wherein the object access

authority set indicates access authorities needed to execute the determined methods [Figure 4;

and paragraphs 0090-0098, and 0109-0113].

20.   As per claim 41, Sheinis discloses wherein determining the access authority for each

determined method calling additional methods comprises: determining the access authorities of

the additional methods called by the method, wherein the object access authority set for the

method additionally includes the determined access authorities of the additional methods called

by the method [paragraphs 0072, 0114, 0130].

21.   As per claim 42, Sheinis discloses wherein access to the execution results is not granted

to the user if the access authority for one determined method is unknown [i.e. reject the call] [

paragraphs 0093, 0094 and 0097].

22.   As per claim 43, Sheinis discloses wherein the object is executed even if access to the

execution results is not granted [paragraphs 0093 and 0094].

23.   As per claim 44, Sheinis discloses storing execution results from the object executor in

response to executing the object of the call request with the access authority set for the object

and an object name [paragraphs 0130, 0144; and claim 13].

24.   As per claim 45, Sheinis discloses returning the execution results to the user having user

access authority permitting access to the object [i.e. return response to requester] [280, Figure

3; and paragraph 0105].

25.   As per claim 46, Srivastava discloses receiving a subsequent call request for the object
from the user; returning the execution results to the user in response to determining that the
execution results are associated with the user without comparing the user access control to the
object access authority [paragraphs 0424-0426].

26.   As per claims 47-55 and 56-64, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in
claims 31, 33, 34, 40-45.

27.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,
however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing
date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DUSTIN NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454